

SOUTHERN PATRIOT.

MARTIN & KENDRICK,

"BE SURE YOU'RE RIGHT, THEN GO A-HEAD."—Crockett.

Proprietors.

VOL. 4.

HOUSTON CHICKASAW COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI SEPTEMBER, 28 1849.

NO 15

POETRY.

Advertisement of a Lost Day

BY MRS. L. H. SIGOURNEY.

Lost! lost! lost!
A gem of countless price,
Cut from the living rock,
And graven in Paradise.
Set round with three times eight,
Large diamonds, clear and bright
And each with sixty smaller ones,
And changeful as the light,

Lost! where the thoughtless throng
In Fashion's mazes wind;
Where rattle Folly's song,
Leaving a sting behind,
Yet to my hand was given,
A golden harp to buy,
Such as the white-robed choirs attune
To deathless minstrelsy.

Lost! lost! lost!
I feel all search is vain;
That gem of countless cost,
Can ne'er be mine again.
I offer no reward,
Till these heart strings sever,
I know that Heaven entrusted gift
Is left away forever.

But when the sea and land,
Like burning scroll have fled,
I'll see it in His hand
Who judgeth quick and dead;
And when of scathe and loss,
That man can ne'er repair,
The dreadful inquiry meets my soul,
What shall it answer there?

POLITICAL.

To William L. Harris, Esq.

I charged you with being in favor of a protective tariff, and this seems especially to have excited you and provoked your wrath. Now Mr. Harris I spoke from what I had heard, and from the record. In the canvass of 1834, you could not be brought to take a stand against the principle of the tariff of 1842—You thought it too high perhaps, and ought to be materially reduced, but you were for retaining the specific and minimum rates of duties, the great objectionable features of the act. At the anti-tariff meeting held at this place on the 3rd of October, 1843, you opposed the resolution of Mr. Whithield condemning the tariff of '42, and prevented its passage, thereby defeated the great object of the meeting. You say you have always warred against a protective tariff, if so, it has been a strange sort of warfare. In 1832, you were for nullifying the tariff of 1828; in 1843, you will not oppose the tariff of 1842, the latter of which was in the opinion of Mr. Calhoun more objectionable in some of its features than the former. I cannot understand this. If it was right to nullify the tariff of 1828, equally right, and even more so, it strikes us, was it to nullify the tariff of 1843—Perhas the inconsistency may be explained by the fact that in 1832, you were a Calhoun man, at least in favor of his views of constitutional principles, and never dreamed of supporting Henry Clay; and in 1843 and '44, you became the warm advocate of that gentleman's election of the presidency. But let the subject pass, with the single remark that I cannot see how it is possible that any man can support for the presidency, one who is a high protective tariff man—the father of the system, when the tariff question too is the great one at issue in the contest, without being himself a protective tariff man, unless, as I have before said, he goes for the man and not for principle.

You say you are opposed to internal improvements by the general government. Well, if you are, I tell you, you will be opposed to General Taylor's administration, for just as sure as the sun shines, Gen. Taylor will recommend a system of internal improvements, not perhaps upon

so grand a scale as that recommended by J. Q. Adams, but still a system wide, expensive and unconstitutional. Such at least is my opinion.

You believe in the constitutionality and expediency of a national bank, but would vote against one unless it seemed the general wish of the people that such an institution should be established, and you think popular sentiment is now against it. To the independent treasury you are and always have been opposed. This, I think you will admit. But you say, I understand (because under the circumstances of the case you could hardly say any thing else,) that you are willing that matters should stand as they are, and let the subtreasury have a fair trial. Still you believe it might be amended to the advantage of the government and the country. So does the administration. Its organ the Republic, calls some of its features barbarous. Now, Mr. Harris, I will tell you what feature of the subtreasury you and the administration defend (yes, as Mr. Clayton once said of the Hon. Felix Grundy, you are still engaged in your old practice defending cries.)—what feature I say you and they would amend; it is the special clause, that is the barbarous feature, that you would annul, and strike out of the law. Such an amendment would emasculate the subtreasury—it would unite the government and banks again and pave the way to the establishment of a national bank, just as did the illegal reception, by Alexander Hamilton, of bank notes in the payment of public dues.—I may be wrong in saying that you are in favor of repealing the special clause, but such is my belief, founded upon the fact that you are a national bank man. If I mistake not every member of the present cabinet with the chair at its head, is in favor of a national bank and would recommend such an institution to Congress if they were not afraid of the people.

You are in favor of distribution, but you say that is dead now, as there is nothing to distribute and the government is in debt; but the debt will be paid in a few years, and when the immense bodies of rich land, in our newly acquired territories are brought into market, distribution will spring up again. Trust us Mr. Harris, it is not dead, but sleeping. I would not vote for any man who is in favor of distributions. I look upon it as dangerous, corrupting and of doubtful constitutionality. It makes the States the stipendiaries of the federal government, which it links to old imperial Rome, granting her favors and sending out her largesses to be her distant provinces. Yet, you, Mr. Harris, who are seeking democratic votes are in favor of distribution—that measure dear to whigs, but odious to democrats.

I have thus briefly summed up your position, as I understand you, upon some of the leading questions, which divides the two parties. I do not think I have misrepresented you, certainly I have not designed to do so. And the inference to me is clear that no consistent democrat can or will vote for you. Even if you had become a bona fide democrat, your conversion has been too recent—too much of the odor of whiggism still clings to permit us to yield you our confidence or support. Your associations, your feelings—your sympathies and prejudices are all with the whigs, and I must hand you over to them.

There is another point, and it is an important one upon which I must address you a few words; it is in regard to the election of Speaker of the House.—This is the incipient act in the opening drama of a new Congress and it is a most important one. Upon the Speaker devolves the appointment of the committees, and he can so arrange them, and the uniform custom is, he does so arrange them, as to give his party the ascendancy on all leading questions. That officer therefore has a powerful—a controlling influence in the House, and his election you know is always considered a most important one. Now Mr. Harris how would you vote in the Speaker's election? Would you vote for a whig or a democrat? I will answer for you, you would vote for a whig, even if that whig was known

to be a high tariff, bank, internal improvement man. You dare not say before any whig audience in the district that you would not. How then can you expect any consistent democrat to vote for you?

I must hasten to a close—you must see, sir, how the current of political events is sweeping along and carrying with it the last vestiges of no partyism to the ocean of oblivion. Look at the results of the elections that have been held since Gen. Taylor was elected on the no-party principle.—Can you point me to a single administration triumph? To one and only, in little Rhode Island, which has been almost always a federal State. On the other hand, contemplating for a moment, sir, the democratic victories, which have struck terror into the hearts of the administration and made them tremble as did Belshazzar of old, on beholding the hand writing on the wall. Connecticut the State of the wooden nutmeg Senator Truman Smith, the man of all work for the administration, has returned three democrats to Congress; in the last congress she had four whig members and not a single democrat. Virginia has elected fourteen democrats and one whig; North Carolina and Alabama stand firm, electing the same number of democrats to Congress as before, but each showing an immense democratic gain in the popular vote. Tennessee has been completely revolutionized. Last year she gave Gen. Taylor over six thousand majority.—This year she elects a democrat Governor by more than fifteen hundred majority, and the democrats gain one member to Congress. Indiana has elected nine democrats and one whig—in the last Congress she had four whig members. Such has been the fate of no party Taylorism in other states and such will be its fate in this State. I point you to these election results, Mr. Harris, merely to remind you of the current of popular sentiment, which has certainly set in irresistibly against this administration. In this district, the result will be as it has been in others, beyond a doubt, showing a democratic gain over the majority of 1847. I rather suspect Mr. Harris, that you already regret having yielded to the solicitations of your friends to become a candidate. This is the first time, I believe, certainly the first time since you have been a citizen of this State that you ever came before the people as a candidate for a political office, and I predict that it will be the last—for you will be ingloriously defeated.

Columbus Democrat

Other accounts of the speaking at Carthage fully confirm the statement of our friend, that Gray is attempting the favorite whig game of professing, as Taylor did no-partyism before the election, or as Tompkins did, that he is a better democrat than McWille, or any body else. The whigs will find out that they have played this game once too often. The people of this district are not to be deceived again by the shallow artifice. The false pretences of Gen. Taylor are but just now being developed, and Gray must have a hard face indeed not only to justify what whiggery has done and is doing, but to applaud the trick and attempt its repetition! As a specimen how McWille "puts it to him," we copy a paragraph from the correspondent of the Yazoo Democrat:

"Col McWille, in a most pointed manner, exposed the true position of General Taylor in regard to his pledges, and satisfactorily proved, that if Gen. Taylor had obtained property in the same manner, and by the same pretences, that he secured Democratic votes, that Mr. Gray as prosecuting attorney, with a whig jury, could convict him of swindling and send him to the penitentiary."

We agree with the correspondent of the Democrat as to the impotence of the election, and unite with him in saying that "every man who calls himself a Democrat and deserts the banner at this election, is not worthy the name and should be spurned with contempt." The political complexion of the district for years may depend on this election, and it behooves our friends to be up and doing.

Gen. Taylor's Eloquence.

A correspondent of the organ takes us to task for what the writer calls our misrepresentation of Gen. Taylor's speeches. He says he has received a letter from a friend at Bedford, who was present at Gen. Taylor's reception of the clergyman then at that place, and that his response was one of unsurpassed and touching eloquence. Now is it possible that the writer of the communication in the organ is so impudent as to attempt to impose such stuff on this community, who know General Taylor, and have heard him attempt to speak? Will he presume to say that any of General Taylor's speeches at receptions here, at Georgetown, or anywhere else in this vicinity, were even respectable efforts? Will he presume to say that even the reading of his reply, prepared by Major Bliss or somebody else, to the Virginia committee, on the occasion of the presentation of the sword, was not most mortifying and painful to those who heard it? It is the most humbuggy and deception to affirm that Gen. Taylor has any of the qualifications of an orator. We are aware that it is death to whiggery to have the true calibre and qualifications of their President made known to the people; and hence the effort to palm him off as a man of statesmanlike capacity and qualifications. How is it to be expected that a man of very ordinary education, who has spent his whole life in the camp and on the frontier, and who has never before filled a single civil station, could, if he had the talents of a Napoleon, become at once a pre-eminent civilian? And how is it possible for General Taylor to be one, whose abilities, everybody knows who has seen and conversed with him, are of a very common sort—not above those possessed by tens of thousands of his countrymen? The thing is absurd and incredible, and the whigs assert to the contrary, in order to keep up the system of humbuggy and deception about General Taylor's qualifications. But it will not avail them. Painful and mortifying as it is to us as American citizens, we feel bound to make known to our distant countrymen the true state of the case. We intend to do it, that no similar imposition may ever again be practiced upon them. We intend to impress them what everybody here knows to be the truth, that General Taylor is not equal to the performance of the high and momentous duties imposed upon him by his great office; that he is an instrument in the hands of the cabinet, who, like a royal regency, carry on the government in his name. The constitution never intended that such a stupendous imposition should be practiced upon the American people. It intended that the President of the United States should be so in fact and not merely in name. It is not so now, under the nominal Presidency of General Taylor. On the contrary, we might as well have Queen Victoria, or what we should much better prefer, a respectable American woman, at the head of the government, as General Taylor, so far as the civil functions of his office are concerned. She could sign her name and General Taylor does but little if anything more.—Union.

More of Heudebert.

A Washington letter writer tells the following "good 'un" of the way things are managed by the appointing powers of the no-party administration. The "naturalized Frenchman" can be no other than Heudebert.

"A few weeks ago, a naturalized Frenchman came to the city and applied for the situation of petty postmaster in one of our Southern towns. He called on the Postmaster General, who plainly told him that he could not be accommodated. He gave Mr. Collamer a piece of his mind, and afterwards informed an ex-member of Congress of his non-success. The ex-member persuaded him to strike high—for a foreign mission, intending his advice as a joke. The Frenchman was in earnest and said that he would, the next day, see Mr. Clayton. This he did and represented to him that he made

many sacrifices for the whig party, and now wanted a foreign mission. Mr. Clayton informed him that two consulships were vacant—Lyons and Bordeaux—and asked him which he would take. The Frenchman, being a native of Bordeaux, said he would go there, but this was engaged and he readily jumped at Lyons. This he got, and is on the eve of departure.

He duly arrived at Jackson on Tuesday last with his commission in his pocket. He was in high spirit and ran about town showing his commission to all whom he met, white and black. He immediately set about disposition of the cooking utensils of his establishment together with his keno table, preparatory to his departure to Lyons. What will he do with his colored wife? He will not, we hope, be permitted to take her to Lyons. But strange things happen these days.—Natchez Free Trade.

THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE U S AT THE CITY OF LYONS, FRANCE.—The following appears in the advertising columns of the last Yazoo Democrat:

Caution to Steamboatmen.

SOME six weeks ago a chattering shaboon of a Frenchman, named JAMES OF JACQUES HEUDEBERT, who has attained some notoriety from the circumstance of his appointment to the responsible station of Consul of the United States to the city of Lyons, in France, engaged passage upon being landed at the latter city, saying that he would leave his baggage until the passage was paid.—The officers of the boat was not so cautious as they might have been, and he obtained his baggage, with profuse promises of speedy payment. He has since been "flourishing" at fashionable watering places in Mississippi, but has "utterly failed, neglected and refused" to pay the amount of his passage, giving no pretext whatever in extenuation; and the undersigned believes that he wilfully swindled the boat out of its dues. This notice is given to warn the officers of other steamboats, and the public generally, against him.

SALSMEN, Clerk.
Str. "Jeff Davis."

Gen. Taylor's Cabinet.

The New York Express, an ultra whig paper, charges the Cabinet of Gen. Taylor with being the cause of the reverses of the party in the recent elections, whatever be their extent.

"The cabinet has not had that national reputation, or, to use another and better phrase, the 'odor of nationality,' which has made whigs willing to bow to it, and hence there has been, beginning with Connecticut and now exhibiting itself in the West an internal struggle and convulsion which, in the elections, has paralyzed us, practically lost us the popular branch of the government."

The Cabinet seem not to be favorites with other friends of the Executive. The New York Herald has had several articles written to show that the Cabinet does not come up to the required standard for the station which they fill, and calling for their dismissal; and the New York Mirror whose editor has just got an office not the less, speak out of school.—Treating of the election of members of Congress, he says:

"If we had a Taylor cabinet—that is, a Cabinet composed of moderate Conservatives rather than ultra whigs—we might hope to keep the Taylor party together; but the attempt to sew the new cloth upon the old garment, and put the new wine in the old bottles, are both impolitic and unscriptural. Gen. Taylor is the most popular man who has ever filled the Presidential chair, and we still look to see his excellent common policy of politicians. The impulses of an honest heart are so much wiser than the schemes of the most cunning intellect, that the people feel the greatest confidence in their President; and all who voted for him are only solicitous that he should keep himself free from the trammels of party."

From the Washington Union.

The whig presses are conferring extraordinary powers upon their imbecil President. They are endowing him even with eloquence, and making him spout speeches which would do credit to a scholar, just as his military despatches and his political letters were palmed upon the country as his own productions.—We hazard nothing in saying that he neither made the speeches nor wrote the letters. A clever amanuensis wrote the one, and a partial reporter fabricated the other. But the correspondent of the Philadelphia News is doing more for him. He is now imparting to him the vigor of youth and the sagacity of second sight. He informs us that on his way to Greensburg, on the road to Pittsburg, his cortege stopped at the paternal residence of Governor Johnston. It was the moment of inspiration: "the President jumped from the carriage with the alacrity of twenty-two, (wonderful indeed!) and at once recognised the governor's father, though he had never seen him before, (more wonderful still.)—Though over eighty years of age, he still walks with the elasticity of forty. The meeting between the two was cordial." The same correspondent follows him to Pittsburg, where he makes him deliver a reply to Mr. Forward, in which he alludes "to the war, the state of the country, &c., with a plainness of style and sincerity which produced a marked effect upon every hearer." A version of this speech has been put forth, which the President was no more capable of making than he was of displaying all the vigor of twenty-two, or all the keenness of second sight. We speak of the composition more than of the sentiments of the address. But there is one passage in it which the General could scarcely have uttered without a blush. He speaks in complimentary strains of the service of the regulars and of the volunteers in the Mexican war, and especially of the volunteers of Pennsylvania. It is a pity that he did not feel the value of these services when he had the opportunity of giving a solid evidence of his gratitude. It is pretty well understood that he had no very exalted opinion of volunteers, and that he was in the habit of expressing these opinions to the secretary of War. But how has he shown his sense of these services? Was it in his proscription of the father of the valiant Drum of Pennsylvania?

Non-Intervention

The following from the Detroit Free Press, a Democratic paper in a non-slaveholding State is another evidence that the Democratic party, as a party will, in all probability, unite upon the doctrine of non-intervention. It is but one of many. We would like to see a parallel article from a Northern Whig paper.

"The Democratic South—what agitation has done.—The Democratic party of the whole country are now rejoicing over the election of a Democratic majority in the next House of Representatives in Congress a majority in which they look to arrest the bad measures of the Taylor administration. But who, let us ask constitute this boasted majority which makes the Democratic party feel so proud, and the whig party so humble? The majority of it, in the proportion of about three to two, is composed of the representatives from the Southern States—the States which, as a general rule, have always secured our majorities in Congress, and in the electoral colleges. This majority of Southern men, which will have the control of the Democratic Congressional caucus at Washington, are opposed to the Wilmot Proviso, and will, of course, nominate and elect their Speaker, unless the Free Soilers bolt, as the Ransom men did last winter in our State Legislature, and unite with the whigs to defeat the caucus nomination.

"And now has the Democracy of the North had their strength reduced so low, in comparison with that of the South, in Congress? It has been done by the slavery agitation, by Wilmot Provisoism, which has accomplished nothing else than to disorganize and weaken the Democratic party, and elect a Whig President.